

Instructions for Using the Plan Review Crosswalk for Review of Local Mitigation Plans

Attached is a Plan Review Crosswalk based on the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance Under the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000*, published by FEMA, dated March 2004. This Plan Review Crosswalk is consistent with the *Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000* (P.L. 106-390), enacted October 30, 2000 and *44 CFR Part 201 – Mitigation Planning, Interim Final Rule* (the Rule), published February 26, 2002.

SCORING SYSTEM

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of a requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a summary score of "Satisfactory." A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing.

When reviewing single jurisdiction plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the boxes for multi-jurisdictional plan requirements. When reviewing multi-jurisdictional plans, reviewers may want to put an N/A in the prerequisite box for single jurisdiction plans.

States that have additional requirements can add them in the appropriate sections of the *Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance* or create a new section and modify this Plan Review Crosswalk to record the score for those requirements.

Optional matrices for assisting in the review of sections on profiling hazards, assessing vulnerability, and identifying and analyzing mitigation actions are found at the end of the Plan Review Crosswalk.

The example below illustrates how to fill in the Plan Review Crosswalk.

Example

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment *shall* include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description *shall* include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	Section II, pp. 4-10	The plan describes the types of assets that are located within geographically defined hazard areas as well as those that would be affected by winter storms.		✓
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	Section II, pp. 10-20	The plan does not address the impact of two of the five hazards addressed in the plan. Required Revisions: • Include a description of the impact of floods and earthquakes on the assets. Recommended Revisions: • This information can be presented in terms of dollar value or percentages of damage.	✓	
SUMMARY SCORE			✓	

Jurisdiction: **PRAIRIE COUNTY, MONTANA**

Local Mitigation Plan Review and Approval Status

Jurisdiction: Prairie County	Title of Plan: Prairie County CWP and PDM Plan	Date of Plan: December 2005
Local Point of Contact: John Pisk	Address: P.O. Box 126 Terry, MT 59349	
Title: Prairie County Disaster and Emergency Services Coordinator		
Agency: Prairie County		
Phone Number: 406-635-5738	E-Mail: jpisk@co.prairie.mt.us	

State Reviewer: Kent Atwood	Title: SHMO	Date: June 29, 2006
--------------------------------	----------------	------------------------

FEMA Reviewer: Ken Crawford Jennifer Fee Wade Nofziger	Title: Mitigation Program Specialist Planner Mitigation Program Specialist	Date: July 7, 2006 August 4, 2006 August 18, 2006
Date Received in FEMA Region VIII	July 3, 2006	
Plan Not Approved		
Plan Approved	XXXXX	
Date Approved	August 21, 2006	

Jurisdiction:	NFIP Status*			
	Y	N	N/A	CRS Class
1. Prairie County (not participating, not mapped)		X		
2. Town of Terry (not participating, not mapped)		X		
3.				

* Notes:

Y = Participating

N = Not Participating

N/A = Not Mapped

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN REVIEW SUMMARY

The plan cannot be approved if the plan has not been formally adopted.

Each requirement includes separate elements. All elements of the requirement must be rated "Satisfactory" in order for the requirement to be fulfilled and receive a score of "Satisfactory." Elements of each requirement are listed on the following pages of the Plan Review Crosswalk. A "Needs Improvement" score on elements shaded in gray (recommended but not required) will not preclude the plan from passing. Reviewer's comments must be provided for requirements receiving a "Needs Improvement" score.

SCORING SYSTEM

Please check one of the following for each requirement.

N – Needs Improvement: The plan does not meet the minimum for the requirement.

Reviewer's comments must be provided.

S – Satisfactory: The plan meets the minimum for the requirement. Reviewer's comments are encouraged, but not required.

Prerequisite(s) (Check Applicable Box)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body:
§201.6(c)(5) **OR**

NOT MET	MET
	X

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption: §201.6(c)(5)
AND

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation:
§201.6(a)(3)

	X
	X

Planning Process

Documentation of the Planning Process: §201.6(b)
and §201.6(c)(1)

N	S
	X

Risk Assessment

Identifying Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Profiling Hazards: §201.6(c)(2)(i)

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures:
§201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A)

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential
Losses: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B)

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development
Trends: §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C)

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment:
§201.6(c)(2)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
X	
X	
	X
	X

Mitigation Strategy

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals: §201.6(c)(3)(i)

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(ii)

Implementation of Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iii)

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions:
§201.6(c)(3)(iv)

N	S
	X
	X
	X
	X

Plan Maintenance Process

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan:
§201.6(c)(4)(i)

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms:
§201.6(c)(4)(ii)

Continued Public Involvement: §201.6(c)(4)(iii)

N	S
	X
	X
	X

LOCAL MITIGATION PLAN APPROVAL STATUS

PLAN NOT APPROVED

☐

PLAN APPROVED

☐

PREREQUISITE(S)

Adoption by the Local Governing Body

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): [The local hazard mitigation plan **shall** include] documentation that the plan has been formally adopted by the governing body of the jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan (e.g., City Council, County Commissioner, Tribal Council).

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Has the local governing body adopted the plan?		N/A		
B. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included?		N/A		
SUMMARY SCORE				N/A

Multi-Jurisdictional Plan Adoption

Requirement §201.6(c)(5): For multi-jurisdictional plans, each jurisdiction requesting approval of the plan **must** document that it has been formally adopted.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan indicate the specific jurisdictions represented in the plan?	vii	Prairie County and the Town of Terry are the jurisdictions represented in the plan.		X
B. For each jurisdiction, has the local governing body adopted the plan?	v-vi	Each jurisdiction adopted the plan.		X
C. Is supporting documentation, such as a resolution, included for each participating jurisdiction?	v-vi	Signed resolutions are provided in the plan.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Participation

Requirement §201.6(a)(3): Multi-jurisdictional plans (e.g., watershed plans) may be accepted, as appropriate, as long as each jurisdiction has participated in the process ... Statewide plans will not be accepted as multi-jurisdictional plans.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			NOT MET	MET
A. Does the plan describe how each jurisdiction participated in the plan's development?	viii	The plan discusses that the participating jurisdictions participated in the plans development through the steering committee or via other meetings and phone calls, specifically by providing data, helping to set priorities, and identifying mitigation projects.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLANNING PROCESS: §201.6(b): *An open public involvement process is essential to the development of an effective plan.*

Documentation of the Planning Process

Requirement §201.6(b): *In order to develop a more comprehensive approach to reducing the effects of natural disasters, the planning process **shall** include:*

- (1) *An opportunity for the public to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to plan approval;*
- (2) *An opportunity for neighboring communities, local and regional agencies involved in hazard mitigation activities, and agencies that have the authority to regulate development, as well as businesses, academia and other private and non-profit interests to be involved in the planning process; and*
- (3) *Review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information.*

Requirement §201.6(c)(1): *[The plan **shall** document] the planning process used to develop the plan, including how it was prepared, who was involved in the process, and how the public was involved.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan provide a narrative description of the process followed to prepare the plan?	Chapter 2 CWPP 5-3- 5-4	The planning process was well documented and includes news articles, sign-in sheets and meeting summaries.		X
B. Does the plan indicate who was involved in the planning process? (For example, who led the development at the staff level and were there any external contributors such as contractors? Who participated on the plan committee, provided information, reviewed drafts, etc.?)	vii, 2-12-2-30, 2-38 CWPP 5-3	The plan indicates that several entities and persons were involved in the planning process including: Prairie County Commissioners, Mayors, Council members of Terry and several others.		X
C. Does the plan indicate how the public was involved? (Was the public provided an opportunity to comment on the plan during the drafting stage and prior to the plan approval?)	2-3-2-6. 2-12-2-38 CWPP 5-4	The plan describes how the public was involved, in great detail, on pages 2-3 through 2-6. Three steering committee meetings were held, which were open to the public. Participants identified and prioritized hazards, drafted goals, and prioritized projects. In addition, a draft of the plan was provided to the County for public review.		X
D. Was there an opportunity for neighboring communities, agencies, businesses, academia, nonprofits, and other interested parties to be involved in the planning process?	Chapter 2 2-12-2-38 CWPP 5-4	Three meetings were held that were open to the public and to neighboring communities and other interested parties. News releases were provided to local newspapers, which discussed the process and announced meetings.		X
E. Does the planning process describe the review and incorporation, if appropriate, of existing plans, studies, reports, and technical information?	3-1	The plan indicates, on page 3-1, that the Montana MHMP and Statewide Hazard Assessment, Montana State Drought Plan, NOAA staff and other sources were reviewed.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

RISK ASSESSMENT: §201.6(c)(2): *The plan shall include a risk assessment that provides the factual basis for activities proposed in the strategy to reduce losses from identified hazards. Local risk assessments must provide sufficient information to enable the jurisdiction to identify and prioritize appropriate mitigation actions to reduce losses from identified hazards.*

Identifying Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the type ... of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
<p>A. Does the plan include a description of the types of all natural hazards that affect the jurisdiction?</p> <p>If the hazard identification omits (without explanation) any hazards commonly recognized as threats to the jurisdiction, this part of the plan cannot receive a Satisfactory score.</p> <p>Consult with the State Hazard Mitigation Officer to identify applicable hazards that may occur in the planning area.</p>	<p>3-1-3-37 CWPP-5-5-5-11</p>	<p>Table 3.1 provides good information on potential hazards for Prairie County. Each hazard profile provides a description of the hazard potentially impacting the county and can be found on pages 3-6-3-27.</p> <p>The plan includes information for all identified hazards, and in most cases, the data used is more extensive than that found from readily available on-line resources. Refer to SHELDUS (www.sheldus.org) for additional information.</p> <p>Flood Insurance Study dated 1981 is available for Prairie County: http://msc.fema.gov/</p> <p>The plan indicates on page 3-20 that there is one major dam in the County. The National Inventory of Dams also indicates that there is one high hazard dam in Prairie County and it appears that NID does not require an EAP for this dam. The National Dam Safety Act requires that an emergency action plan (EAP) be completed for high hazard dams. It appears that the NID does not require an EAP for this dam. Please see http://crunch.tec.army.mil/nid/webpages/nid.cfm (introduction and download dam data) for National Dam Inventory information.</p> <p>Online EPA data suggests that there are no toxic release inventory sites in Prairie County. Please see http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer/ for more information.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Profiling Hazards

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(i): *[The risk assessment shall include a] description of the ... location and extent of all natural hazards that can affect the jurisdiction. The plan shall include information on previous occurrences of hazard events and on the probability of future hazard events.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the risk assessment identify the location (i.e., geographic area affected) of each natural hazard addressed in the plan?	3-1-3-37 CWPP-5-5-5-11	The plan describes the geographical area of all identified hazards in great detail and can be found in the hazard profiles. Several of the hazards include a map, which depict the hazards location.		X
B. Does the risk assessment identify the extent (i.e., magnitude or severity) of each hazard addressed in the plan?	3-1-3-37 CWPP-5-5-5-11	The magnitude of past events is highlighted in the identified hazard historical occurrences and the vulnerability section. The plan also includes potential loss estimates for all identified hazards.		X
C. Does the plan provide information on previous occurrences of each hazard addressed in the plan?	3-1-3-37 CWPP-5-5-5-11	Previous occurrences of each type of hazard are addressed in the hazard profiles. A few of the identified hazards include tables, which list date, location, type, human loss, estimated damage. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: It may be helpful to develop a table that lists location of hazard, date, time, magnitude, death, injuries, property damage and crop damage, in addition to the narrative description. To ensure consistency, the criteria identified i.e. location; damage estimate etc. should be the same for all tables.		X
D. Does the plan include the probability of future events (i.e., chance of occurrence) for each hazard addressed in the plan?	3-1-3-37 CWPP-5-5-5-11	Each hazard profile discusses probability of future events within the Vulnerability and Potential Loss Estimate section.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Overview

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii): [The risk assessment **shall** include a] description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to the hazards described in paragraph (c)(2)(i) of this section. This description **shall** include an overall summary of each hazard and its impact on the community.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include an overall summary description of the jurisdiction's vulnerability to each hazard?	3-1-3-37 CWPP 5-6-5-10	The plan does a great job at discussing vulnerability. Each identified hazard has a Vulnerability and Potential Loss section that discusses direct and indirect effects, potential losses. This section discusses probability, which also addresses vulnerability. The plan also includes a section on Assets and Vulnerable Populations on pages 3-28-3-33.		X
B. Does the plan address the impact of each hazard on the jurisdiction?	3-1-3-37 CWPP 5-6-5-10	The hazard profiles identify past events and provide time periods and a general description of the event. The plan would be enhanced if the tables found within the Historical Occurrences section included: location, loss structures, injuries, deaths, and costs. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: Please include location, loss structures, injuries, deaths, and costs in the history section of the hazard profiles.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Assessing Vulnerability: Identifying Structures

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(A): The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing and future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard area

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	3-33-3-473-28-3-34 CWPP 5-17	Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing. The plan does a good job of discussing vulnerable structures within the Assets and Vulnerable Populations section, although the discussion and tables within this section are not in relationship to identified hazards, except for fire in the CWPP. Recommended Revisions: For all identified hazards specify the number of existing buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area .	X	

B. Does the plan describe vulnerability in terms of the types and numbers of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities located in the identified hazard areas?	1-5-1-7	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan includes an excellent section on Land Use and Development Trends. Although future development is discussed in general terms, it needs to be specific to identified hazard areas to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update:</p> <p>For all identified hazards, specify the number of future buildings, infrastructure, and critical facilities within each hazard area.</p>	X	
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Estimating Potential Losses

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(B): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of an] estimate of the potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures identified in paragraph (c)(2)(i)(A) of this section and a description of the methodology used to prepare the estimate

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan estimate potential dollar losses to vulnerable structures?	3-29-3-30 CWPP 5-16-5-17	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan includes potential dollar losses for identified assets within the County in Table 3.8. Table 3.8 presents dollar estimates for the insured/replacement value of the identified critical facilities, although they are not in relation to identified hazards.</p> <p>Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update:</p> <p>Please list potential dollar losses in relation to identified hazards.</p>	X	
B. Does the plan describe the methodology used to prepare the estimate?	3-30 CWPP 5-16	<p>Note: A “Needs Improvement” score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing.</p> <p>The plan indicates that the potential dollar loss estimate came from accessed property values.</p>		X
SUMMARY SCORE			X	

Assessing Vulnerability: Analyzing Development Trends

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(ii)(C): [The plan **should** describe vulnerability in terms of] providing a general description of land uses and development trends within the community so that mitigation options can be considered in future land use decisions.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe land uses and development trends?	1-5-1-7 CWPP 5-6-5-8	Note: A "Needs Improvement" score on this requirement will not preclude the plan from passing. Pan provides a section on Land Use/development trends on pages 1-7-1-15; Population projections; land ownership maps.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Risk Assessment

Requirement §201.6(c)(2)(iii): For multi-jurisdictional plans, the risk assessment **must** assess each jurisdiction's risks where they vary from the risks facing the entire planning area.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan include a risk assessment for each participating jurisdiction as needed to reflect unique or varied risks?	3-1-3-37 CWPP 5-6-5-10	The plan does include discussions, found within the hazard profiles, which states that all hazards are county wide. Recommended Revisions: Identify areas that are more susceptible to the identified hazards than other areas.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

MITIGATION STRATEGY: §201.6(c)(3): The plan shall include a mitigation strategy that provides the jurisdiction's blueprint for reducing the potential losses identified in the risk assessment, based on existing authorities, policies, programs and resources, and its ability to expand on and improve these existing tools.

Local Hazard Mitigation Goals

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(i): [The hazard mitigation strategy **shall** include a] description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include a description of mitigation goals to reduce or avoid long-term vulnerabilities to the identified hazards? (GOALS are long-term; what the community wants, i.e. "eliminate flood damage"; and based on risk assessment findings.)	4-2-4-5 CWPP 5-21	The plan lists seven goals. Most of them appear to be directly related to mitigation.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Identification and Analysis of Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(ii): *[The mitigation strategy **shall** include a] section that identifies and analyzes a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects being considered to reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on new and existing buildings and infrastructure.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify and analyze a comprehensive range of specific mitigation actions and projects for each hazard?	4-2-4-5 CWPP 5-21-5-22	The plan identifies and analyzes a broad range of mitigation measures.		X
B. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on new buildings and infrastructure?	4-2-4-5 CWPP 5-21-5-22	Projects affect new and existing buildings and infrastructure.		X
C. Do the identified actions and projects address reducing the effects of hazards on existing buildings and infrastructure?	4-3-4-7 CWPP 5-21-5-22	Same as above.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Implementation of Mitigation Actions

Requirement: §201.6(c)(3)(iii): *[The mitigation strategy section **shall** include] an action plan describing how the actions identified in section (c)(3)(ii) will be prioritized, implemented, and administered by the local jurisdiction. Prioritization **shall** include a special emphasis on the extent to which benefits are maximized according to a cost benefit review of the proposed projects and their associated costs.*

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the mitigation strategy include how the actions are prioritized ? (For example, is there a discussion of the process and criteria used?)	4-5-4-8 CWPP 5-21-5-22	The plan provides an excellent discussion on the methodology used to prioritize the actions. The plan indicates that projects were ranked by high, medium, or low based on specific criteria including: number of lives at risk, value of property at risk, infrastructure at risk, risk of business interruptions, and cost/benefit of the project.		X
B. Does the mitigation strategy address how the actions will be implemented and administered ? (For example, does it identify the responsible department, existing and potential resources, and timeframe?)	4-6-4-10 CWPP 5-23-5-24	The plan includes a detailed table that lists the project description, benefits, costs, schedule, rank, and potential resources. The plan indicates that the projects will be accomplished as funding becomes available.		X
C. Does the prioritization process include an emphasis on the use of a cost-benefit review (see page 3-36 of <i>Multi-Hazard Mitigation Planning Guidance</i>) to maximize benefits?	4-5-4-13 CWPP 5-64-5-72	The plan includes a discussion on putting an emphasis on benefits compared to costs. Table 4.1 lists projects and provides a scale of low to high for benefits and costs and Table 4.2 offers more information on benefits in relation to cost.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Multi-Jurisdictional Mitigation Actions

Requirement §201.6(c)(3)(iv): For multi-jurisdictional plans, there **must** be identifiable action items specific to the jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval or credit of the plan.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A Does the plan include at least one identifiable action item for each jurisdiction requesting FEMA approval of the plan?	4-9-4-19 CWPP 5-23	While most of the actions are meant for county-wide use, there are specific measures for each jurisdiction.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

PLAN MAINTENANCE PROCESS

Monitoring, Evaluating, and Updating the Plan

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(i): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] section describing the method and schedule of monitoring, evaluating, and updating the mitigation plan within a five-year cycle.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for monitoring the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for monitoring and include a schedule for reports, site visits, phone calls, and meetings?)	6-1	The plan indicates the Prairie County Commissioner will be responsible for ensuring that the CWPP/PDM plan is kept current and also evaluate its effectiveness. A schedule includes three situations that would trigger the review of the plan.		X
B. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for evaluating the plan? (For example, does it identify the party responsible for evaluating the plan and include the criteria used to evaluate the plan?)	6-1	The plan indicates the Prairie County Commissioner will be responsible for ensuring that the CWPP/PDM plan is kept current and also evaluate its effectiveness. The Prairie County DES coordinator and the Chair of the LEPC will be the co-leads. The criteria that the plan will be evaluated against are listed on page 6-1.		X
C. Does the plan describe the method and schedule for updating the plan within the five-year cycle?	6-1	The plan indicates that every five years, beginning 2010 the plan will be updated and submitted to the Montana DES and FEMA Regional Office for their approval.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Incorporation into Existing Planning Mechanisms

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(ii): [The plan **shall** include a] process by which local governments incorporate the requirements of the mitigation plan into other planning mechanisms such as comprehensive or capital improvement plans, when appropriate.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan identify other local planning mechanisms available for incorporating the requirements of the mitigation plan?	6-2	The plan does include other plans that the mitigation plan could be incorporated into. The planning initiatives identified include existing plans, annual budget, and growth policy. Recommended Revisions for the Five Year Update: Please be more specific about which existing plans that the PDM can be incorporated into i.e. economic development etc.		X
B. Does the plan include a process by which the local government will incorporate the requirements in other plans, when appropriate?	6-2	The plan states, on page 6-2 that elements of the PDM will be incorporated into other plans by the County DES coordinator, as appropriate.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X

Continued Public Involvement

Requirement §201.6(c)(4)(iii): [The plan maintenance process **shall** include a] discussion on how the community will continue public participation in the plan maintenance process.

Element	Location in the Plan (section or annex and page #)	Reviewer's Comments	SCORE	
			N	S
A. Does the plan explain how continued public participation will be obtained? (For example, will there be public notices, an on-going mitigation plan committee, or annual review meetings with stakeholders?)	6-2	The LEPC meeting will be noticed in the local newspaper and the participants of the steering committee will be encouraged to attend. The plan also indicates that the DES will maintain a file to store comments or input on changes.		X
SUMMARY SCORE				X